LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

FROM GAITSKELL TO WILSON

E. M. Winterton

★

AIRCRAFT AND THE ECONOMY

G. H. Doughty

★

BATTLE FOR JOBS: THE LOBBY

W. Morgan Williams: C. Maxwell: H. Green

★

Also: Marxism after 80 Years (R.P.D.)—Trade Union Structure—Macartney on Mayfair

MARCH 1963

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLV No. 3 MARCH . 1963

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month: Marxism After Eighty Years. *Hour of Decision—Forty Years Back—Forty Years On—Vision of* 1983 *—Battle to Save Mankind—And Now?—Towards the End of the Road—End Game and Mate*.....**R.P.D.** 99

From Gaitskell to Wilson. What lies behind the Establishment's interest in the choice of Labour's leader.....**E. M. Winterton** 107

Aircraft and British Economy. The Draughtsmen's General Secretary pinpoints the industry's problems and needs..... **G. H. Doughty** 111

Negro Emancipation. Karl Marx's analysis confirmed in this account of an anti-slavery demonstration 117

Battle for Jobs: The Lobbies. Wales, Scotland and the North-East show the strength of this fight.....**W. Morgan Williams, Charles Maxwell, Horace Green** 123

Black and Yellow. An exposure of pride and prejudice in the golden square mile of Mayfair.....**Wilfred Macartney** 128

Voting in United Nations. Key resolutions on independence of colonial countries 133

Trade Union Growth. Historical sketch pointing the need for change in structure, as outlined in the Communist Party's Draft Resolution on Trade Unions.....**Jim Gardner** 135

What Readers Say: On the Price Rise.....**Angela Tuckett** 97

Illustration: Lancashire Cotton Operatives, 1863 120-121

Book Reviews. 'Income Distribution and Social Change', by R. M. Titmuss; and 'Takeover', by William Mennell: *John Eaton;* 'To Katanga and Back', by Conor Cruise O'Brien: *C. Desmond Greaves;* 'Goering' by Manvell and Fraenkel: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.* 139

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT READERS SAY
About The Price Rise

As soon as the February *Labour Monthly* was published explaining that the price would have to go to 2s., beginning with this issue, letters began to come in from readers with their reactions. Here are some of the first to reach us:

William Gallacher, *Paisley.*

I see *L.M.* is up in price. To honour the occasion, give the attached pound note to Angela.

E. Strachan Rogers, *Brixton.*

In response to the announcement in the February issue, I am increasing my monthly tribute to £3 3s.

H. A. Scott, *Edinburgh.*

I enclose an extra 5s. to cover the additional cost of my subscription from March to December, since I had just renewed. I am sure readers will understand your difficult problem and the necessity for raising the price. My thanks to all concerned for the good work done.

Joe Whelan, *Linby, Notts.*

It is a pity you find yourselves in such a position that compels you to increase the price. However, I believe your friends will know whose fault it is—the rotten economics of capitalism. You have done well to delay it so long. It may make it a bit more difficult to sell; but even if it does, it will be well worth the effort. When you think of people in colonial countries who walk 20 miles just to hear someone read some pages from *L.M.*; when you think of the brave lads who gave their lives or the men and women who are in gaol because they fight for justice, peace and independence, remember *L.M.* inspires their struggles and gives guidance to the winning of the battles. I think we are getting off light when we can go to the newsagent and order it for 2s. Don't make any attempt to apologise for putting it up. I can assure you, as a miner, it shines a better light for me than my cap lamp in the dark pit. We owe you more than you will ever owe us.

D. Smith, *South Shields.*

Dear Sir, I enclose 5s. to cover the extra on my subscription between March and December. And I also enclose £1 towards the *Labour Monthly* printing fund.

R. M. Lang, *Angus.*

Herewith 10s. to cover any increase for the current year in my sub. My copy goes first to a member of the Labour Party locally, who has also seen the wisdom of reading along a Marxist line. It then goes on, at your suggestion not a few years ago, to the trade unions in Berlin. Don't trouble to answer this, please; you have lots else to do.

G. Chambers, *Sussex.*

Here is my mite towards your appeal—let me know as soon as the increased rate is due on my subscription. I thought the February number very good, both R.P.D. and Andrew Rothstein. But how slow the English world is to move! I fear the official Labour Party has no

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire to change the present system; it wants to share in it—the bigger share the better!

D. Sandwell, *Yorkshire.*

Dear Madam, Although I read a great many political journals, I have never yet set eyes on one with such a high degree of journalistic skill and sheer readability as the *Labour Monthly*, to which I was introduced only two years ago. This magazine should be read by all the workers of this country, for whom it so courageously struggles with never diminishing devotion. Please find enclosed a small donation for fund.

'Backslider', *Essex.*

In the twilight of life, able to do very little for The Cause, I am able to face the future with fortitude and a burning belief in the final liberation of mankind. So much of this I owe to you all. It is a mighty inspiration. One day, let me hope very soon, the veil of lies will be torn from before the eyes of our fellow countrymen. Good luck to your efforts.

Bill Somerset, *Northern Ireland*

The increase will be a challenge as well as a body blow; our fraternity will not so lightly give up their favourite mentor. If some have to abandon buying their own, I shall suggest they should continue to pay their 1s. 6d., to share a copy with another. That would mean a shilling for the fund, and all would still read it. I hope it won't be necessary, but you know what unemployment figures we have here.

Les Bates, *Blackburn*

Yes, *L.M.* must go up. The writing is on the wall for us Socialists and Communists if we want our truths in print for guidance. We shall have to make them pay their way. The Queen's head is on all coins—still.

To these correspondents and to their like amongst our readers in Britain and the world, our deep appreciation and thanks.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

£98 19s. 10d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'Windfall', £10; R. McLeod, 5s; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; Royston Green (year's donation in advance), £2 8s; G. C. Fitt, 1s; 'Backslider', 10s; S. Morrissy, £1; R.F.B., £3; N. Usher, 2s 6d; L'Humanite, 4s; L. Bates, 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 2s; Oldham Branch, 1s; Marie Philibert, 13s; 'In memory of Joe Brien', 3s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'S. Mill', £1; R. Dodd, £1; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; D. Sandwell, 4s; C.T.H., £2 2s; J. A. Smith, 6s; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 5s; J. Tarver, 5s; B. W. Mackay, 5s 6d; 'The Butcher family', 10s: S. Townsend, 10s; E.J.B., 10s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: W. G. Garvey, 3s; H. Cohen, £1 1s; W. D. Johnston, 10s; J. Steele, 10s; P. Feltham, 2s; W. L. Dutton, 2s; A. Bush, £1; R. C. Champion, 7s; H. F. List, 10s 6d; P. J. Waller, 13s; M. Bennett, 10s; H. M. McClatchey, 2s; W. M. Cormack, 5s; J. A. Fraser, 10s; D. A. Hamilton, £1; A. Ramage, 10s; E. Williams, £1; J. L. Smith, 5s; Dr. W. Thomas, 2s; C. H. B. Locke, 10s; J. Redfern, £5; Miss C. Wrench, 2s 6d; A. E. Giebler, 5s; P. Tero, 7s 6d; E. J. Gillett, 10s; M.G.J., 6s; H. A. Scott, 2s; Mrs. K. P. Ghosh, 2s; J. J. Christie, 5s; S. R. Broadbridge, 12s; G. Callicott, £2 2s; A. L. Parsons, 8s; J. Laird, 10s; A. Albert, 2s; A. W. Hickson, £1; L. E. Bond, 5s; A. Jordan, 6s 9d; Mary Vanstone, £3 3s; J. D. Munro, 3s; T. Drinkwater, £1 2s; T. Shields, £1; Finchley C.N.D., £2; Dr. J. S. D. Bacon, £1; T. Sorbie, £1; H. Rosen, 3s; D. P. Rees, 2s; W. S. Harland, 11s 6d; H. C. Smith, £1 2s; J. MacQueen, 8s; R. Owen, 1s; 'Companytown, Canada', £6; F. H. Luck, £1; L. Wyvil, 8s; D. A. Ware, 2s; R. Alderson, 7s; C. Rosenberg, 7s; H. M. Barnett, 6s; G. Dowling, £2 2s; M. R. Davies, 5s; W. Davies, 2s 9d; Mrs. D. Spencer, 4s; T. Crichton, £1; W. Rickeard, £1; E. M. Berlyn, 15s 3d; Miss E. Midgley, 2s; R. Smillie, 5s; A. G. Neville, 2s 6d; F. G. Colman, 10s; J. Wood, 12s; E.M. (U.S.A.), 14s 7d; W.H. (Australia), £5; L.R. (U.S.A.), £4 18s.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

MARXISM AFTER EIGHTY YEARS

The First World War and the October Revolution ushered in the general crisis of capitalism. The second stage of this crisis developed at the time of the Second World War and the socialist revolutions that took place in a number of European and Asian countries. World capitalism has now entered a new, third stage of that crisis, the principal feature of which is that its development was not connected with a world war.

Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, 1961.

EIGHTY years ago Marx died. This eightieth anniversary is taking place in a world situation which is powerfully confirming all his teaching. New horizons are opening. On the one hand, the socialist world, guided by Marxism, is drawing close to the moment when it will represent the majority of world production, as it has already demonstrated its superiority in the rate of economic advance, science, technique, education and social provision. On the other hand, the deepening bankruptcy of the capitalist world is further shown in the present economic difficulties of all capitalist countries, the collapse of the post-war 'economic miracles' and 'managed capitalism', under-use of capacity and extension of mass unemployment, sharpening of trade conflicts and inter-imperialist antagonisms, and cracking of the Atlantic Holy Alliance.

Hours of Decision

Certainly the road is not yet smooth. The arms race still drains resources alike in the capitalist and socialist worlds. The menace of war is still grave. But it is significant that, whereas the previous advances of socialism have been achieved in the conditions of social explosion through the contradictions of capitalism bursting into war, the present advance is being achieved in and through the fight for peace, the united blocking of the capitalist drive to war by the new world majority, representing socialism and national liberation. This is a new world situation, not merely confirming the teaching of Marxism, but requiring to be carried forward along fresh paths in the light of that teaching. The coming years are the most critical. All the contradictions of the present economic and political situation are most sharply featured in Britain, the original cradle of capitalism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and now the scene of its most manifest decay. The failure of the Macmillan Conservative Government after a decade of fiascoes is recognised by all. But is Labour ready with any adequate alternative programme? Such is the crucial question facing us at the present moment in this particular corner of an ever more rapidly changing world.

Forty Years Back and Forty Years On

The first occasion for one of these periodic reviews of the advance of Marxism in the world in these Notes was forty years ago when we wrote under the title 'Marxism After Forty Years'. That was in 1923. The period between the death of Marx and the foundation of this journal forty-two years ago was less than the period between the present number and that foundation issue. The living personal memory of Marx and Engels was still strong among many then active. Lenin was still alive to give direct leadership to the world (and incidentally the inspiration to the foundation of this journal). The young Russian Socialist Revolution had beaten off the wars of intervention, and advanced in that year to the new Constitution, replacing the old 'Russian Federation of Soviet Socialist Republics' by the new 'Union of Soviet Socialist Republics', thereby delivering a death blow to the last remnants of the old Russian chauvinist traditions by obliterating the very name 'Russia' from the official title and revealing instead the new principle of the union of free and equal nations (a warning to Western editors who still insist on calling the U.S.S.R. 'Russia'). In the capitalist world Poincaré was invading the Ruhr; Curzon dispatched his ultimatum to Moscow; Fascism (still a new term) had seized Italy; Hitler attempted his first coup in Munich. Grim shadows of the future.

Vision of 1983

In those early Notes 'Marxism After Forty Years' we wrote:

> World history today is Marxism alive. There was no need to refute his critics. History refutes them. Even while they pen their last lines to their Critical Examination they find themselves having to pack up their bags before the gathering storm of the Collapse and the Revolution. A hundred times 'disproved' and 'discredited' by critics whose names are now only known to Marxian students, for half a century declared 'obsolete' and 'antiquated' by theorists whose writings already carry about them the flavour of pre-war antiquity, a thousand times denied and watered down by faint-hearted followers afraid to break

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with bourgeois learning and prejudice, today Marx stands master in the modern world—the Key to its interpretation and the power that moves it.

With the confidence of those years we threw out the challenge:

A hundred years from Marx's birth saw the first Proletarian Revolution and Proletarian State. Will a hundred years from his death see the World Proletarian Republic?

Twenty years still to run. 1983. Much may still happen. Marxism predicts world trends, not dates. But, judging by the advance of these forty years, the prospect of the victory of communism on a world scale by 1983 is not inconceivable. Certainly the race advances with accelerating speed. The goal draws closer.

Marxism After Fifty Years

1933. The offensive of world reaction against Communism and human progress has entered a new and desperate stage. Hitler has been placed in power from above by the German ruling class, backed by Anglo-French-American finance and diplomacy to crush the German working class, to rearm Germany and prepare the second world war. This grim outcome of the renunciation of Marxism by the Western labour movement, of the lying promises of Social Democracy to offer an alternative painless path, leading in fact to world economic crisis and fascism and the drive to a new world war, prompted us to draw the lesson in writing of 'Marxism After Fifty Years':

Where today have all the movements that have abandoned Marxism, that have abandoned the Communism of Marx and Engels, the majority movements of post-war Social Democracy and Labourism, where have they brought the working class? In every country where they have dominated, they have brought the working class to a pitch of weakness and defeat, of misery and worsening of conditions, of staggering under the blows of a daily more aggressive world reaction, without parallel for half a century. In Italy, to the victory of Fascism. In Germany, where fifteen years ago the workers held all in their hands, the Counter-Revolution has been put back in the saddle by the help of Social Democracy, and the workers' movement is left at the mercy of the murder-bands of Hitler. In Britain, where millions and millions of workers listened hopefully to the call of Labourism, put Labour Governments in office, came out on the General Strike, today the capitalist offensive throws all the burdens of the crisis upon the workers, reaction reigns in the form of the National Government, and all the leaders of the Labour Party cynically throw off the professions of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allegiance to the movement they no longer need, and join the National Government, leaving demoralisation behind.

Indulgence must be asked for thus quoting old words of thirty years ago. But when today the same shamed and discredited Social Democracy has the effrontery to present itself anew, under the latest alias of 'Democratic Socialism'—concealing the same poisonous anti-Marxist contents and formulas under the new label because they know that the old label now stinks in the nostrils of all—then it is necessary to remind the younger generation of the record. Drawing together the lesson of 1933:

> The examples of the Russian Revolution and of the German Revolution over these fifteen years teach the workers of the world on a giant scale how a workers' revolution can conquer and how a workers' revolution can be laid in the dust.

Battle to Save Mankind

Hitler. Fascism. Nazi Rearmament. Munich. The supreme offensive of world counter-revolution to destroy Marxism and Communism for ever. From the moment Hitler was placed in power in 1933 the British Premier Macdonald flew to Geneva to propose the doubling of the German Army and to Rome to propose a Western Four-Power Pact of Britain, France, Hitler and Mussolini. Foreshadowings of the future. The supreme ordeal of our time had opened. The supreme battle to save the future of humanity. Of this testing time and battle now opening we wrote in March, 1933:

> The whole world today is Marxism in action. Every other theory and world outlook lies in ruins, shattered and impotent before the march of events. Marxism alone rides the storm, and casts its searchlight in front on the path forward of humanity. . . . Marxism is the weapon of this concrete fight in progress, of a fight both theoretical and practical, of what is in the last resort a physical fight of millions of men against the existing régime of violence and exploitation. . . . It was never more necessary than today when the fight is close and urgent, when all the forces of barbarism, of world war more destructive than ever before, of imperialist savagery and anarchy, of Hitlerism and all 'the wild asses of the devil' are threatening their supreme attempt to engulf the world and destroy all human culture, and when the sole force of world order and civilisation is the Communist International and the Soviet Union.

In this ordeal the international communist movement and the Soviet Union proved worthy of their trust and saved mankind from fascist slavery and destruction.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism After Sixty Years

1943. The year of Stalingrad. The height of the ordeal—and the first gleam of the dawn of victory. The international counter-revolution did not conquer. The Nazi armies, before which every other army in Europe had broken in rout, met the armies of socialism and met their master. The Munichite front had been broken by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. The phoney war, which combined passivity against Hitler with plans of military adventures against the Soviet Union, had been succeeded by the alternative tactics of the peculiar alliance, when the withholding of the second front for three years enabled the entire weight of the Hitlerite forces to be hurled against the Soviet Union, with the confident calculation and prediction of all the Western general staffs and politicians that the Soviet Union would be destroyed. Their calculations were frustrated. By 1943 panic seized the Western rulers at the prospect of the fall of fascism and the victory of communism. The planning of the post-war Western front against the Soviet Union and communism; the preparation of the Anglo-American atom bomb under the Quebec Agreement as the weapon, not against fascism, but for future domination against the Soviet Union; the Churchill secret memorandum against 'Russian barbarism' in post-war Europe; the organisation of the second front, after the Nazi armies were already beaten, to prevent the victory of the peoples in Europe: all date from this turning point. But everywhere the peoples rose in the enthusiasm of alliance with the Soviet people for liberation. The citadels of fascism fell. The old capitalist order was in fact only restored in Europe as far as the writ of the Anglo-American armies ran. Elsewhere the people's anti-fascist liberation movement took over, and entered on the building of socialism. The surge of national liberation swept through Asia and Africa. A new world was arising. The costs had been heavy, not least in the Soviet Union. But in this hour of trial and ordeal Marxism had received its highest vindication.

Marxism After Seventy Years

1953. The new world has arisen. Socialism is now a world system. The glorious victory of the Chinese Revolution has, as Lenin predicted in the last words he wrote, made the world victory of socialism assured. From one-twelfth of the population of the world before the war socialism now reaches to over one-third, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together with the new independent states of national liberation embraces three-quarters of mankind. The old counter-revolutionary front of the wars of intervention and of the Hitlerite Axis has now been renewed on a yet more extensive scale as the cold war front of American imperialism, extending its network of military alliances, subsidies and bases into every continent. In vain. 1953 was the year of inauguration of Dulles as Secretary of State, and in his inaugural television broadcast he complained that the capitalist world was suffering 'encirclement' by communism. In our review of 'Marxism After Seventy Years' we summarised the world picture as seen by Dulles:

> Dulles surveyed the 'gloomy world situation' for the benefit of his viewers, and what did he see? In Asia? Communism. In the Middle East? Communism. In Africa? Communism. In South America? Communism. And in Western Europe the American 'investment', as he described it, of thirty billion dollars to ensure obedient vassals was in danger of being rendered null and void by the resistance of the peoples. And on top of this came the supreme complaint, expressed in his inaugural statement to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee on January 15: 'The Russians have achieved all these results without using a single Russian soldier.'
>
> Strange and revealing complaint. The American war lords have covered land and sea in every continent and region of the world within their reach with their bombers and their bases, their troops and military missions. They have spread destruction and devastation thousands of miles from their shores. And to their amazement they discover that everywhere the peoples turn against them. They discover that Communism is spreading everywhere 'without a single Russian soldier'. Incomprehensible situation to the mentality of a Dulles. For to him the words of Lenin are beyond his understanding: *'The teachings of Marxism are all-powerful because they are true.'*

Dulles has passed from the scene. His clarion calls for 'Massive Retaliation' to 'Roll Back the Tide of Communism' no longer win an echo. The new lords of Washington have not yet abandoned his dreams. But their troubles are mounting.

And Now?

1963. Ten more years of accelerating world changes have sped forward. We are moving into a new world situation of limitless new possibilities to strain the imagination of the most daring. The shift in the world balance is today universally recognised, and has even begun to find partial reflection in the United Nations. The old

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conservative centres of imperialism, still the most wealthy, still bristling with arms and threats, have begun to be seen by all as the declining minority sector of the world. During these years each successive major aggressive adventure of imperialism and counter-revolution has met with defeat. Korea. Vietnam. Suez. Hungary. Algeria. Most critical of all for the demonstration of the new still precarious world balance the experience of Cuba, and the checking of the planned aggression of the American giant last year against the heroic Cuban nation, thanks to Soviet aid. Few and rarer have been the temporary successes of counter-revolution, as in the American armed overthrow of the popular régime in Guatemala, or the present shameful reactionary coup and terror régime in Iraq. But the tide of history cannot be reversed. The post-war dreams of nuclear domination of the world by Western imperialism are ended for ever. Therewith the foundations of the cold war have begun to crack. New alignments and shifts begin to appear in inter-imperialist relations. But the practical conclusions have not yet been drawn. The framework of the old still seeks to strangle the emergence of the new. Hence the peculiar new unstable international situation into which we have entered, pregnant with menace and opportunities, and calling aloud for the action of the peoples to take advantage of the possibilities now opening before us.

Towards the End of the Road

It is a new world situation without previous parallel. The philosophy of imperialism has always been the philosophy of the Big Stick, as the old President Theodore Roosevelt termed it; of domination; of superior power to dictate to the lesser breeds; or war to the death between rival imperialist powers for the redivision of the world. The gospel of the atom bomb as the post-war Saviour of Western civilisation; of Fulton; of the Truman Doctrine; of Dulles, breathed this philosophy. Now the conditions are changed. The dialogue has to be between equals. Dimly the new rulers of America begin to envisage this, then shrink back from the conclusions. The arms race is raised to yet more crazy heights. The current United States peace-time arms budget exceeds the war-time peak of 1945. Economically crippled and staggering Britain has to shoulder a crushing arms increase to close on two thousand million pounds. More and more voices ask: To what end? Since there can no longer be victory of the old social order by superior power, the choice becomes voluntary suicide ('Better dead than red'). It is a measure of the bankruptcy of the old order that such a slogan can be coined.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

End Game and Mate

Logic points to the alternative: Peaceful Co-existence. The parallel peaceful existence of differing social systems, providing the most favourable conditions for the great social transition of our epoch. Freedom of every people to choose their own future. No more foreign military occupations and bases and sectional military blocs. An end to nuclear weapons. Disarmament. These themes become, no longer merely pious aspirations, but the bargaining issues of international political negotiations. But the negotiations have so far invariably become stalled. For the alternative also fills the Western rulers with horror. Peaceful Co-existence? But that would mean the peaceful victory of Communism throughout the world. Never. Raise higher the barricade of weapons of power; invent new weapons; new, more deadly, poisonous, multi-killing weapons; extend the arms race throughout space, through outer space. So the fateful round is renewed. The vicious circle revolves without conclusion. Either way the rulers of the old order see the end of the road in sight. Mate in two moves. The vicious circle can only be broken by the action of the peoples. And in this action also Britain, Britain under its present rulers despised and kicked about by all, can play a key part, once its people awaken to their present opportunity.

February 18, 1963 R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

Unemployment: A Call to Action

Confronted with what is euphemistically called 'the slump', the Government of Great Britain found itself completely incapable of providing any measure by which to surmount the difficulty. Its immediate efforts were centred on balancing the Budget because, for the first time within memory, there was a danger that the national accounts of the United Kingdom might show a deficit. Apart from this the attitude of the Government was no different from the mob of financiers and capitalists who kept repeating during the last months of 1920 (as they were to keep on repeating during the whole of 1921 and 1922) that there was bound, very shortly, to be a revival of trade. . . . But if the leaders of capitalism have been no better than witch doctors, the leaders of Labour have been like the ignorant believers in their witchcraft. . . . The most remarkable thing is that this unemployment was treated as a 'question' and a 'problem' instead of being itself a call to action of the whole of the workers against the capitalists.

(From 'The Labour Movement and the Unemployed', by R. Page Arnot, *Labour Monthly*, March, 1923.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM GAITSKELL TO WILSON

E. M. Winterton

WITH the election of Harold Wilson on February 14, the Labour Party has its leader and the country a future Labour Prime Minister. But it would be wrong to forget the unprecedented events in British public life which took place around the death of Hugh Gaitskell and the preparations for choosing his successor. It would be unpardonably shortsighted not to see how the most experienced capitalist class in the world, taken off its guard under the stress of sudden events, revealed the intense interest it has in the affairs of the Labour Party going one way, and not another.

The fatal illness of Hugh Gaitskell was treated by the mouthpieces of capitalism—the BBC in particular—like that of a monarch, with special reports all through the day. When the end came on January 18, the Prime Minister made a television obituary speech, reproduced on sound radio, within 24 hours. Then on January 21, at the first subsequent meeting of the Commons, came the special 24-hour adjournment: 'no other leader of the Opposition has ever been so honoured', wrote *The Times* parliamentary correspondent. The same could be said of the memorial service at Westminster Abbey on January 31, with its 2,000-strong congregation including most Ministers, the Diplomatic Corps, representatives of the Queen and her husband, and the Archbishop of Canterbury officiating.

Was all this simply a token of respect for a brilliant personality and political leader? The comments of the capitalist press itself are the answer. What the 'Establishment', or, in Marx's and Lenin's language, the executive committee of the capitalist class, were striving to show, was that the British capitalist system—the nation *as they understand it*—had lost the most acceptable Labour Party leader it had ever had, one in whose hands the interests of class collaboration were safe.

This is what the *Guardian* editorial meant when it wrote (January 19) that any new Labour Party leader must follow Gaitskell in his 'non-doctrinaire approach to economic and industrial policy', which is, being interpreted, his many years' fight against depriving the capitalist class of the means of production in order to abolish it altogether. His 'firm commitment to collective defence and multilateral disarmament' means his support of Anglo-American-West

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German-French war alliance against the Soviet Union, and the spending of one-third of the Budget since 1950 on armaments. For his 'readiness to see gradual reform of the Labour Party's structure from within' read: to impose rule by Labour M.P.s on the vast machinery built up for parliamentary purposes since 1900 by the British workers, just as in the parties of big business—with leaders of the bigger unions having the right to use influence behind the scenes, much as the business men do for the Tories and the Liberals, but nothing more. It was the loss of *such* a leader that *The Times* was mourning—one whose successful defiance of the Scarborough Conference decisions 'should have permanently devalued the conference as a policy-making body'—when it wrote (January 24) that Gaitskell 'would have been of the greatest service to the party and the nation at a time when so many strands of British policy have become snarled or been abruptly severed'.

That was the point. The policies pursued by all British Governments since 1945 were bankrupt. Gaitskell had gone at a time when 'the Government may be said to be almost reeling on the ropes', and there was no time to spare (*The Times* political correspondent on January 21): when there was a 'crisis inherent in the political and economic situation of Britain' (*The Times* leading article, February 11). The utter fiasco of the Tory Government's policy, to use George Brown's inelegant but expressive terms, had found expression in 'a slap in the face in Paris, the order of the boot in Brussels, and a kick in the Bahamas as well, just to make sure'. Brown forgot to mention the post-war right-wing Labour Governments which, pursuing the same policies, were equally responsible for such ignominious consequences. It was a time, too, when swiftly-mounting mass unemployment was bringing back to Britain the miseries of the thirties—those same miseries of which right-wing Labour intellectuals, whose leader was Gaitskell, had declared, just over ten years ago in *New Fabian Essays,* that 'chronic excess of the supply of labour over the demand for it, as we all know, has disappeared from the social scene' (Strachey); and that 'there will be no repetition of Jarrow and Ebbw Vale, dole queues and hunger marches' (Crosland).

In such a situation, who could tell what would happen if the new Labour Party leader, instead of continuing to defy the basic principles of Socialism, carried further the alarming trend which Gaitskell had shown in the last months of his life, of attacking Tory surrender of Britain's interests and independence in the Common

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Market negotiations? Might that not give new encouragement to the rank-and-file demand for Socialist policies which had already defeated Gaitskell once, over 'Clause 4' in 1960? Or, as the *Economist* blurted out on January 26, might there not be 'graver misgivings about running the risk that in a few months' time the prime ministership of Great Britain might suddenly be thrust into the hands of an unprepared and inexperienced new Labour Party leader?'

With one accord the capitalist press began trying to guard against such a risk. George Brown of course was the man for the job (need one recall his inspiring right-wing record?). He together with Gordon Walker—who by the way hastened to decline the honour—would provide a combination of 'experience, temperament and abilities': while Wilson 'might well be judged outside as likely to embitter party and class politics' (*The Times,* January 24). The *Economist* was all for Brown, too—Wilson displays 'over-agility of mind', is weak on 'statesmanship at home' and cannot command 'wholehearted trust from Britain's allies abroad' (January 26). Wilson was 'too clever by half' (Tory candidates at a London brains trust, February 7). Brown was 'more able than sometimes appears . . . blunt, rough, straightforward'—whereas Wilson was 'cool, devious, calculating, intellectual as well as clever', and 'thought by some an intriguer' (*Daily Telegraph,* February 8). And so on.

There was one laughable, almost pathetic, moment when an attempt was made to pass off that well-known right winger, James Callaghan—ardent champion of Nato, supporter of an 'incomes policy' amounting to 'wage restraint', thrown off the Labour Party's N.E.C. by the constituency parties just because of his views—as a middle-of-the-road man. This was because some of the pundits suspected that Brown's rugged politics were more acceptable to Fleet Street than to the working class. Callaghan had 'always managed to avoid being labelled either right or left' (*Daily Telegraph,* January 25). He stood 'a better chance of defeating Wilson than Brown would' (*Guardian,* the same day). He was a 'middle or compromise candidate' (*The Times,* February 1). And so on—but not for long.

Finally, when the first ballot showed that Harold Wilson was after all the likely choice, the tone changed once more. The oracles began assuring their readers that things were not so black after all. Wilson was not quite the 'weak-on-reds' that they had made him out to be, and in any case pressure could be brought to bear. For a time, at

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any rate, 'he would need to have a Gaitskellite bias' in order to command a majority, and left wingers 'are doomed to disappointment', *The Times* political correspondent had already forecast on February 4, and he repeated in other words on February 8, after the ballot. 'The reconciliation is bound to come on right-wing terms. . . The pursuit of middle-class votes is not a left-wing occupation' (Rees-Mogg in the *Sunday Times,* February 10), while James Margach in the same issue foretold that Wilson's centre position would be 'broadly identical' with that of Attlee and Gaitskell before him. In fact he could resist the left better than Brown. Naturally, these assurances became doubly sure after Wilson's election—he will 'hold the Gaitskell line' (Jacobson, *Daily Herald* editor, February 15).

These explanations, adjusted to the situation which the forces of reaction had to face, are instructive. They give away just how those forces intend to bring pressure to bear on the Labour Party leadership, and what channels they intend to use. The one force they say nothing about, however, is that which influenced Gaitskell over the Common Market last year and the Labour M.P.s since his death—rank-and-file opinion. You might think from their writings that the working class did not exist at all, or had no means of expressing its view, to M.P.s and leaders alike. Yet these are the days of the big lobbies on unemployment; of the great struggle at Fords; of the campaign of the miners and the railwaymen against artificially-organised redundancy; of the progressive victories in the co-operative elections; of the rise in membership of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League in face of all the slanders and victimisations! *The direct intervention of the working class in British politics*—this is what the political speculators on 'Brown v. Wilson' most fear. This can frustrate all the knavish tricks of the enemies of Socialism. This is what can bring back into the everyday political struggle, even in Parliament and in spite of Gaitskellite tradition, the burning need to apply Clause 4—'common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange'—now that the bankruptcy of their private ownership is shouting aloud.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

AIRCRAFT AND BRITISH ECONOMY

G. H. Doughty

General Secretary, Draughtsmen's and Allied Technicians' Association.

AT the present time the whole of British economy is in a mess and substantial sections are deep in a trough of despair. After being led to believe that the economic salvation of Britain lay in joining the Common Market, the breakdown of the negotiations in Brussels appears to have been a blow of considerable force, capable of producing shattering results. It matters not whether the rosy promise of economic rehabilitation did lie within membership of the European Economic Community. What is transparently obvious now, is that the Government put all its economic eggs into the Common Market basket and, after the crash, is grasping around for some relief from the effects of ten years of Tory rule and freedom from national planning.

Why should the aircraft industry merit special lament at this time of national crisis? The answer lies in the fact that the history of the British aircraft industry is significant. It is an example of lost opportunities, due to absence of proper planning and forward thinking, and has involved very large sums of public money, for which we have all too little to show. It is now a matter of national prestige. In the period immediately following the war, the world looked for new passenger and freight planes, including the civil versions of the large-scale, long-range aircraft, which had been produced during the war. The scene was set for a dramatic expansion into the field of commercial flying. During the war Britain had tended to concentrate on fighters and medium-range bombers, whilst both the Americans and Russians had developed heavy long-range aircraft. Nevertheless, the position was open for Britain to make rapid strides in a world which, for several years to come, would not produce strong competition from other Western European countries. America still had a large domestic market to satisfy and the Soviet Union was deeply committed to large-scale rebuilding of its lands and those sections of its industry which had been devastated by war.

Three important factors appear in retrospect to have been in Britain's favour at that time. This country was principally respon-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible for the development of the jet engine. Indeed, one of the more favourable aspects of this matter is that until recently British aero engines have kept in front and have provided much employment. In addition, the post-war Labour Government brought the major civil aircraft users in this country under integrated public ownership. Also, arising from activities during the war, we had already in existence a highly developed research establishment under Government control, devoted to the needs of the aircraft industry.

So it would appear that at that time there was a large potential demand. Britain had the resources of manufacture; the basic research facilities and access to public funds when public needs were in existence. Yet, today the industry is struggling. It is technically behind the Americans in the production of long-range jet aircraft; has been overtaken by the French for short and medium haul jet machines and is manoeuvred out of many markets for defence aircraft and service freighters by political considerations. As is well known, our defence and our advance striking power has in the last decade been strategically designed around a large V-Bomber air force which was equipped with an air-to-land missile. (Stand-off types.) But this was then made redundant by the Nassau Agreement, which was to replace the bomber with a submarine entirely dependent on an American designed and manufactured missile for the delivery of its hostile armament. Our defence planners now run around like scalded cats. The aircraft industry, having gone through a long period of hesitancy, stop and go, dependent upon what particular aspect of defence technique was popular at a certain time, now grinds slowly to lower production levels. Even the previously fully occupied aero engine division has its troubles.

In civil flying we have had some successes, an outstanding one being the Viscount, but we have also had too many failures and partial successes. Now, our manufacturers have the job of selling aircraft, produced some years after foreign types of similar capacity and ability, in a physically and politically restricted market. What then has gone wrong? Much has been written about each section of the industry and many inquests have been held. But in this article one can do no more than refer to some of the more important factors which have helped to bring the unfortunate situation about.

Probably transcending all other considerations is the absence of any co-related central direction of design and research, or control of production. The industry, in spite of its reliance upon public funds for development and the production of most civil and military orders

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solely from the Government, still manufactures almost entirely for reasons of profit; and in this direction has done very well for its shareholders. Much of its past effort was dissipated by the production of too many types and undeveloped prototypes; too many competing elements existed, each of which had too little research capacity to plan ahead or to engage in the ever-increasingly expensive newer types of aircraft.

For long periods the industry was feather-bedded by development and defence contracts, most of which were terminated after large amounts of public money had been used, and before anything of use had been produced. The lack of effective market research for civil aircraft has been obvious. Astonishingly enough—in view of the bottomless pit for public money in the development stage—so was the absence of Government assistance in arranging part exchange deals with overseas users, to encourage them to buy newer types of British aircraft. This compares most unfavourably with the practice of the Americans and others.

The many problems of the industry became so obvious a few years ago that even the Government noticed them. By pressure, through a threat to apply economic sanctions, by withholding orders and development contracts, they brought about a financial reconstruction of the industry. So there are now two major air frame makers, two major aero engine makers and one group handling helicopters. However, neither the largely state-owned Short Bros. & Harland factory, nor the privately-owned Handley Page company, have found their place within these groups; so long as they remain outside, complete production assimilation is not achieved, since they are active competitors to the main groups and manufacturers of similar types of aircraft. The re-organisation of the groups in terms of production is far from complete, and in truth many components of the major groups exist rather like they did before financial reorganisation, so that the vision of more efficient production organisation due to re-organisation is somewhat illusory.

These problems were all enough in themselves to create major headaches, but the whole position has been exacerbated by a series of the most extraordinary reversals of defence policy, both in regard to the design and the strategic use of aircraft and air missiles. The war in Korea started this, and since then, the industry has been at the mercy of rapidly changing personalities in the War Ministry and the Ministry of Aviation. If there is anything consistent in this series of events, it is that slowly and surely the British aircraft

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industry has been squeezed and squeezed; and slowly and surely it is being replaced by equipment purchased from the United States.

An ability to design and manufacture modern civil and military aircraft and aero power units has become a matter of prestige to the major industrialised countries of the world. The resources to do this are considerable, the technological demands are enormous and the field of application ranges far beyond the actual construction of aircraft. New materials have to be produced to stand up to strains never previously experienced. Air friction can be so great as to burn up many of the metals at present widely used in aircraft construction; new problems challenge the aerodynamicist and enormous capital outlay is necessary to deal with the basic question of feasibility of design studies, let alone the actual manufacture of new types.

It may be that more than one aircraft-producing nation desires that these developments be not taken too quickly, because of the risks to capital and the need to undertake highly specialised research, without having a reasonable prospect of an early reward. But it will be done by someone, and here the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. possess many natural advantages. It may be considered easy for Britain to drop out of the race for developing new types of aircraft; but if she does, and even if she then concentrates on the production of the conventional types, she must inevitably reduce herself to a position in which the rest of the world will regard her as a second-class aircraft power, and she will certainly prejudice the position she now holds as being the leading producer of aero engines.

This is not an easy decision to make, but far more will be lost if we decide to hold back than if we risk the research necessary to the manufacture of new types of aircraft. Our national airlines, for the time being, have to use American aircraft for trans-Atlantic journeys and our European services find stern opposition from foreign-made medium-range jet airliners. We have also recently learned that in spite of our hopes of producing a commercially useful helicopter of British design, we have to purchase machines from the U.S.A., and it appears that we shall in future make a machine of American design, but with British engines.

How long we can rely on using our own engines must depend on what role we play in the design of airframes. With the newer types envisaged, the frame and power unit tend to become a complete entity and lack of knowledge of one part prejudices new development work on the other part. The aero engine industry ceases to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a 'jobbing shop' for the airframe industry. Yet the British aircraft manufacturing industry is contracting. The closure of De Havilland's Portsmouth and Christchurch factories, the Gloucester works of Gloster Whitworth Co., and the Reading works of Handley Page, immediately threatened the employment of thousands of workpeople and technicians and lost a considerable part of our manufacturing capacity. This is not all, for we know that in many other aircraft and aero engine factories the future is grim and more redundancy is inevitable. Napiers of Acton is the next factory to go out of existence. The limited world demand for conventional civil aircraft is now aggressively chased by many rivals and the demand for military types is difficult to assess.

We cannot call time back, nor can we use justifiable recriminations against disastrous decisions in the past, to find immediate solutions to our present difficulties. But these conclusions can be drawn:

That the aircraft industry in Britain appears to be drifting into a major crisis;

That public money is still being used to assist the industry, but without any appreciable public rewards;

Employment in the industry is in a critical condition and no one faces the future with confidence;

That the cautious attitude of the present day management and the profit conscious background against which it works is most unlikely to meet the needs of the time;

That the patchy organisation arising from recent amalgamations is badly equipped to deal with future demands; and

That the industry, due to its almost complete reliance on public funds, is holding back from the necessary design studies required for an investigation into supersonic aircraft.

The Government seems to be hovering between a policy of 'wait and see' what happens in the U.S.A. or the result of participation within a form of international consortium with the French. This path has been already trodden by American interests—one wonders how much is left for us, or was this part of the Common Market deal?

The modern aircraft industry is a highly sophisticated affair. It is highly complex in structure, requiring huge capital resources for production and design and heavily dependent on Government for defence and civil orders and facilities for fundamental research. It is most significant that where it has made most progress in recent years is the Soviet Union, where the public resources of a large country back the domestic aircraft industry, or in the U.S.A., where public money is available in large amounts through defence contract

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arrangements. More recently the French Government has made very large sums available to the French aircraft industry for new research.

It is quite certain that enormous resources in technical knowhow, equipment, materials, manufacturing capacity and skilled labour has to be supplied to the British aircraft industry if it is to survive as a major influence. The industry must be planned for a dynamic purpose. The British people will ultimately have to decide whether the Government, which, after all, is the principal customer and provider, shall continue to provide massive sums without ownership responsibilities and benefits.

A short-term policy would appear to be:

A national and international sales, research and service organisation;

Assistance in part exchange of existing machines by airline operators in the sale of new fleets;

A shorter life span for other, older types of aircraft now flying and more rigid service and safety requirements;

A central planning and advisory service to the industry on future civil types to be designed.

A long-term policy can only be effective if it embraces a readiness to engage (even beyond enquiries into feasibility) in full design studies, especially into the possibility of a British designed and engined, medium-range, supersonic airliner for international civil use. It should be within our technical competence to produce ultimately a Mach. 2 type capable of a performance at least equal to that of any other country. A Mach. 3 machine is probably outside the immediate possibility of British resources, but may be the subject of a feasibility investigation with other countries, especially those in the Commonwealth. It is not merely political considerations that compel us to say that the very nature of the aircraft industry must ultimately make the British Government accept the function of ownership and management.

BUILDING THE STOCK EXCHANGE FOR A.D. 2000

The great danger is that discussion about the rebuilding of the Stock Exchange will be far too concerned with mere technical details. The significant question to be decided is what sort of functions the Stock Exchange can be expected to perform in the conditions of A.D. 2000.

(*The Times*, May 24, 1962.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEGRO EMANCIPATION

[*This is an abridged extract from* Illustrated London News *of February 7, 1863, describing the demonstration of January 29, 1863, in London, of which we printed a picture in the January* Labour Monthly. *On this 80th Anniversary of the death of Karl Marx, it is interesting to see how this vivid eyewitness account strikingly confirms the analysis he made at the time. Marx himself wrote of another such demonstration: 'I attended the meeting held by Bright at the head of the Trade Unions. He looked quite like an Independent and every time he said, "In the United States no kings, no bishops", there was a burst of applause. The workers themselves spoke excellently, with a complete absence of bourgeois rhetoric and without in the least concealing their opposition to the capitalists (whom Father Bright, by the way, also attacked). How soon the English workers will free themselves from their apparent bourgeois infection one must wait and see'.—Ed.*, L.M.]

HERE WE HAVE BEEN for many months past pretty well all of one mind as to the American question, that is to say, convinced the North is fighting for 'empire', and the South for 'independence'; convinced that if the latter did not exactly behave well in the outbreak of the war, it has fought so splendidly since that it cannot be subjugated, and must, therefore, in the end succeed; convinced, finally, that it would be best on the whole to leave slavery at present where it is, in the hands of the masters, and trust to the progress of humanity, of knowledge of economical laws, and of the absence of irritation through abolition attacks, to do away ultimately with so great an evil. That, we believe, is a fair statement of the opinions predominant generally through society, in accordance with the ceaseless teaching of nine-tenths of the whole English press.

But of late a new element has begun to be dimly visible. As the Northern Legislation and Administration have become of a more decidedly anti-slavery cast we have heard of small local meetings rising like bubbles to the surface of public opinion, and evaporating with a feeble breath in favour of the North. Then it undoubtedly excited surprise when the Lancashire operatives were so quiet under all their sufferings as to render it impossible to rouse them into an active agitation for blockade-breaking; and somehow it began to be whispered about that the explanation of their conduct was that they didn't feel quite satisfied about slavery not being at the bottom of the whole business of Southern revolt. But when Mr. Lincoln's proclamation of September last, offering emancipation with compensation up to Jan. 1, and threatening emancipation without compensation on and after that day if his offer were not accepted — when this broke like a thunder-clap upon the world we entered upon a new and difficult, and anxious period. For, while on the one hand there were but few persons who did not still loudly denounce slavery, there were still fewer who did not see that Mr.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln's Government had taken that tremendous step not because it was advisable or right in itself, but because he found the North could not beat the South without doing so. Of course, in saying this we do not say or suggest that Mr. Lincoln was a hypocrite, or that he acted in opposition to his known character, antecedents, or wishes. We only say, as a matter of fact which cannot be disputed, that while the previous anti-slavery measures, such as (among others) the abolition of slavery in Columbia, the anti-slave trade treaty with England, the permanent exclusion of slavery from the territories, and the offer of Congress to assist the work of abolition by compensation, all obviously sprang from a genuine anti-slavery sentiment, this particular proclamation, the last of the series, as obviously did not, but from the military failures of the North. No wonder, then, that the general current of opinion (having been previously such as we have described it) still remained on the whole friendly to the South and unfriendly to the North, or that it became generally believed that Mr. Lincoln's 'military measure' would prove in its working a very inhuman measure, as leading to a servile war . . .

Then suddenly Manchester burst out with an assemblage several thousand strong in the Free Trade Hall. Liverpool merchants and others assembled to prepare for the renewal in their town of the former anti-slavery agitation, and decided, by an 'overwhelming majority', to do so, . . .

The Emancipation Society ventured at last to issue its challenge to universal London, and 'respectfully' to invite 'all parties' to the great room of Exeter Hall on the night of Thursday the 29th of January, 1863 . . . Having tickets for reserved seats we did not present ourselves till about ten minutes before the time specified on them—seven o'clock; but as we ascend the steps of the portico, we are warned by the streams of people that we are, perhaps, taking the matter too leisurely . . . Everywhere we find dense masses of people; we are about to make the Englishman's last confession and acknowledge ourselves beaten, when, happily, we come across one of the speakers of the night floundering in the same difficult strait, but who obviously *must* get in. That fact gives us new hope. We appeal to him. He gallantly takes us in tow, shouts 'Reporter!' when advance is otherwise impossible, and so we get at last into a sort of little black hole of Calcutta, where we grow at once hopeless of further progress and certain of being stifled if we stay where we are. Here, however, to our immense relief, a door opens; some half dozen of us are shot suddenly forwards and luckily do not fall; another instant and we are running up the stairs of the little box or covered way that admits us to the platform, and there find breathing space and full opportunity to drink in, in one wondering, awe-stricken glance, the sublime spectacle of a vast sea of upturned faces, looking up towards another sea scarcely less large, that in defiance of all the laws of gravity, has ascended and overflowed every nook and corner of the upraised expanse of the orchestra, leaving only the organ in the centre calmly above the excited and sloping tide of life . . .

Yet it is especially worthy of note (whatever the use made of the fact) that none of the ordinary attractions helped to bring together this wonderful gathering. It was quite true what has been said, that no eminent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statesmen or politicians were here; that few or none of the old and famous anti-slavery families were represented; that none of the speakers were men of genius; that commerce sent none of its merchant princes; the aristocracy and gentry none of their conspicuous members. But for that very reason we were driven to confess how great must have been the 'ground-swell' of public opinion before it could thus burst upon our astonished eyes with all the suddeness and fury of the maelstrom and the waterspout, unless, indeed, we accept the solution since offered—that Federal money was the mainspring!

The speakers of the evening were the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel; Mr. Hughes, the well-known author of 'Tom Brown', the Rev. Mr. Newman Hall; Mr. Taylor, the member for Leicester; and Mr. Ludlow, a well-known contributor to *Macmillan's Magazine* . . .

If it had been possible, after watching the reception, given to the first sentences of the chairman, the Rev. Mr. Evans, to doubt the tone and temper of the assembled multitude, it was clearly impossible to do so when he referred in a perfectly dispassionate manner to those who wished to see America divided into two confederacies. He was interrupted by a single voice that cried out 'Emancipation and union!' and then, as if that phrase had been a kind of electric shock that went to every heart, there broke forth the most tremendous popular enthusiasm it has ever been our fortune to witness. It could not stop, but went on and on, the whole audience having leaped to their feet with hats and handkerchiefs waving, having apparently only waited for some such signal to relieve themselves from the almost painful, because suspended, enthusiasm with which they overflowed. This incident told all that any one could have needed to know as to the feelings and views of the meeting . . . These interruptions, with those arising from the constant re-echoing of cheers from the other two meetings below and outside, gave quite a tone to the evening.

We shall not attempt to describe the speeches. We desire only to note those passages in them which helped to bring out into strong relief the state of opinion that prevailed in the meeting. Mr. Noel's speech was studded with such points. His narrative of recent happenings in the South with regard to the cruel punishment of the slaves; his assertion, founded on the testimony of Mr. Jay, that at least one negro had been burned annually for twenty years for rising against their masters; his characterisation of the Southern leaders as men of powerful intellect and energy; his demand to know the meaning of Mr. Davis's statement that the proclamation has doomed millions of beings of an inferior race to extermination — all these were caught up so rapturously as to convey the impression that the speaker must have expressed the views of his auditory even more perfectly than his own . . .

Decidedly the crowning speech of the evening was Mr. Newman Hall's. His voice alone of all the speakers' voices filled easily and perfectly the enormous space. His slight physique, earnest face, and self-possessed yet impressive manner, must have given to many, as it did to us, an idea of the strength of the Puritan element yet existing among us, but not allied, as so often it was of old, to fanaticism or to spiritual blindness towards everything grand or beautiful that is not directly and obviously religious

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lancashire Cott

A hundred years ago, Karl Marx wrote of the sta
taken by the Lancashire cotton workers over Ne
slavery and the American Civil War: 'This is a new a

Here is a contemporary d

2 3 4 6 8
5 7

1, Knocker-up. 2, Reeler. 3, Hotwate
Winder. 7, Scavenger. 8, Over-looker to
weaver. 11, Carder. 12, Self-acting mind

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Operatives, 1863

lliant proof of the indestructible excellence of the glish popular masses, of that excellence which is secret of England's greatness'.

f the cotton operatives:

10 12 13 15

11 14

4, Hand-mule spinner. 5, Half-timer. 6, mules. 9, Throstle-spinner. 10, Power-loom aver. 14, Power-loom weaver. 15, Throstle-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . We quote the peroration of his speech, with its magnificent invective against slavery, where he asserts:—

That 'God has made of one blood all nations to dwell upon the face of all the earth (cheers); that there is no right so sacred as that which a man has to himself, no wrong so flagrant as that of robbing a man of himself (cheers); that it is an abomination to steal a man and to sell him (loud cheers); that it is no less an abomination to breed a man and to sell him (Hear, hear) than for man to barter away his own offspring for gold (loud cheers); that it is an abomination to expose men and women on the auction-block and feel their muscles and hand them over to the highest bidder as you would cattle (Shame!); that it is an abomination to deny to a woman the rights of chastity and maternity (Hear, hear); that it is an abomination judicially to declare that a coloured man has no rights that a white man need not respect (Hear, hear); that it is an abomination to flog a naked woman, whether she be a Hungarian Countess or an African slave (hear, hear); that it is an abomination to fine, imprison, flog, and, on a repetition of the act, hang a man for teaching another man to read the Bible (Hear, hear); that it is hideous blasphemy to cite that Bible of a God of love in defence of such abominations (Hear, hear); that a confederacy of men fighting in order to commit these abominations should be regarded as engaged in portentous piracy rather than in legitimate warfare (cheers); that the conscience and heart of free England can never wish to recognise an empire avowing as its cornerstone the right to maintain and extend these abominations (cheers); and, lastly, as the recognition of an empire involves reception of its Ambassador, that the loyalty of Great Britain loathes the very idea of such an indignity being offered to the Royal Lady we delight to venerate as that her pure, matronly, and widowed hand, which wields only the sceptre of love over the free, should ever be contaminated by the kiss of any representative of so foul a conspiracy against civilisation, humanity and God!' We should despair of any attempt to give an adequate notion of the feeling called forth towards our Queen or against slavery by the last sentence . . .

And then, on once more reaching the open air, we heard that a second meeting had been held in Exeter Street, larger than the first one, in order to draw off the crowds from some unhappy Southern sympathisers who had been too freely expressing their sentiments. No less, therefore, than four distinct meetings had been developed out of the one intended meeting, each with its own chairman and speakers, among whom were Mr. Noel, Mr. Shaen, and several gentlemen who had been in America, including the chaplain of General Burnside.

We conclude, as we began, with no intention to express here our own views. But this one remark may be permitted. Whatever the result as regards North and South — the permanent rupture or the reunion of the States—it is impossible to doubt that the Divine hand is so fashioning things as to destroy slavery.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BATTLE FOR JOBS: THE LOBBIES

W. Morgan Williams*

[With close on a million without work in the United Kingdom, immense significance attaches to actions by unemployed and employed alike now developing on a large scale. On March 26 a remarkable Lobby of Parliament will take place, organised by all the Federations of Trades Councils of England's industrial North, with massive support from hard-hit Scotland and Belfast. A special feature is the combination of local demonstrations with those converging on the metropolis. Last month the spirited and impressive Lobby jointly led by Welsh miners and railwaymen set the pace. A picture of what is involved is given by the following contributions from Wales, Scotland and the North West.—Ed., L.M.]

THE great Lobby of Parliament from the Principality of Wales, organised jointly by the miners and us railwaymen—a portent in itself—was by no means the first step in the campaign. And neither, indeed, will it be the last. Vast as the interest is which has been aroused, we saw the Lobby as only a step on the way to winning for every worker in Wales, and in all Britain, the right to a secure job in the place where he was born.

These Lobbies should make it clear to all that the present Tory policies must be ended. The vast majority of the people have to understand, for example, that with present Government policies, further closures are inevitable. That is why both railwaymen and miners looked upon the Lobby from Wales as one of the major steps towards bringing about different policies in two major nationalised industries.

Before it is too late, what must be brought home is this; as in other parts of Britain, today it is the traditional industries in Wales which are in danger. Coal, agriculture, tinplate, Government services and railways have lost 100,000 jobs since 1948, whilst 107 pits have gone and nearly 34,000 jobs in the mines. Many branch lines and approximately 8,000 positions on railways have gone. It is as though a great 'natural disaster' had hit our country. It is true that up until recently the worst feature, total unemployment, was largely avoided, either by men getting into neighbouring pits and by wholesale transfers on the railways or by men leaving these industries. But the situation now is that with every closure it is ever more difficult to place those who are 'redundant'. Railwaymen have to uproot themselves from their house,

*As many of our readers will know, Mr. Morgan Williams, who is of course writing this article in his personal capacity, is Organiser of District No. 6 (Cardiff) of the National Union of Railwaymen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retire early, or seek employment in areas where no house is available.

A continuation of present Tory policies means death to many of our rural communities in our lovely hinterland and to certain valley townships where coal is the only industry, whilst other valleys will be simply dormitory towns for the coastal strip. Welsh industry is more diversified than pre-war. Along the south coastal strip, there have been built steel giants, like Llanwern, the Margam, Velindre and Trostre works of the Steel Company of Wales; oil refineries; chemical works; car plants and light engineering. But these have not absorbed the labour available in spite of the fact that 26,000 men and 15,000 women left Wales between 1951 and 1961. This means that four per cent of our working population has gone, all of them young people, to more fortunate areas of Britain, or have emigrated overseas. Big firms like I.C.I., B.S.A., and Murphy's Radios who came to Wales when they had plenty of work, have closed or are closing down here with a hard core of 5·7% (in January) of our labour force unemployed. Is it any wonder that the fear of a return to the black days of the 1930's is being expressed in our valleys? Under the age of 18 there are over 3,000 who are without jobs, over half of these without their first job. The young will naturally get attracted to more fortunate areas, particularly if both work and travel facilities disappear in their own. With them depart the future of our heritage and culture. We have experienced this before; we do not intend to let it happen again.

Over the past eighteen months considerable concern has been expressed in Wales about rail closures and their effect on rural and valley communities. Objections were registered by county and local authorities through the Transport Users Consultative Committee. Two major all-Welsh conferences of local authorities were held and their working committee saw the Minister of Transport. Members of Parliament used the Grand Committee in the House of Commons to raise the problem. All this was to no avail. Mass working class action was then stepped up. The strike of railwaymen on October 3, 1962 was followed by the Joint Conference called by miners and railwaymen on October 27, at Cardiff, with many joint local meetings held since. This rally brought it home to thousands what continuing present Tory policies mean for our land and people. That is why there was so much interest aroused within the Principality and support from outside it when we went to Parliament to insist to the Tory Members in particular on certain demands. We insisted that they should call an immediate halt to closures of lines and workshops and transport be looked on as a whole; that railways should be given what road users get free; and the industry should be co-ordinated and integrated to serve the nation. We insisted that there must be a national fuel policy to give a planned and guaranteed future for coal, oil, gas and electricity. We insisted that the coal and rail industries should be freed from the burden of interest and compensation charges. Finally we insisted that suitable alternative industries should be *directed* to *all* areas where closures are unavoidable.

These demands of the Lobby are supported in whole, or part, by the vast majority of the cross section of the people of Wales and their elected representatives in the House of Commons, the trade unions, local

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authorities and bodies like chambers of commerce, the churches, those representative of farmers and tourist trades and so on. These Lobbies from different parts of Britain are a first step, a long stride forward. A halt cannot be called to them now.

On Clydeside

UNEMPLOYMENT is on the tip of everyone's tongue here in Glasgow. Alongside unemployment in the people's mind are the Tory myths and right-wing social democrat ideas: they are on trial for their life. In the Battle for Jobs on Clydeside, take a look first at the plight of those already out of work; then at the grim prospects in shipbuilding, the railways, mines and engineering; and finally at the sort of fight the Scottish working class is putting up.

With this creeping paralysis in our industry, Glasgow's growing unemployment figure is reaching the twenty-five thousand mark. It is all very well for the economist to look at the unemployed as a line on a piece of paper, or, as the Tory Cabinet Ministers would say, as part of a 'healthy 4 per cent pool of unemployment'. But what about the individual who is unemployed? I think that what hits you when you are first unemployed is the loneliness, the feeling you are on your own. The very next day you are pounding the street from factory to factory looking for work. You try everywhere and everyone you know; sooner or later you get that feeling you are going to be out of work for a long time. Then, when the last few shillings of your lying-time dwindle away, that is when you are faced with the idea of trying to exist on dole money. From the £4 12s. 6d. a married man can get from the Labour Exchange he must pay: the rent, electricity bill, gas, coal for a start; and nearly every young couple who are trying to build a home have some kind of hire purchase agreement. After he has paid for those he can think of buying some food. A suit? That's out; and if he does not want to starve, he will not buy many cigarettes or any refreshments. The people who have been 'made redundant' were earning, at an average, between £14 and £15 a week; now they must find it harder to live than the old age pensioner. Who could disagree that the majority must find unemployment a form of mental torture?

Amongst the unemployed in Glasgow there are four thousand under the age of 18; some are coming straight from school on the dole. What a deplorable state of affairs that the youth, the future of Britain, is compelled to stand in the demoralising queues at the Labour Exchange. Those who know the youth through the Young Communist League, the Young Socialists, the Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament or any other youth organisation, will undoubtedly agree that the vast majority are a credit to their day and age. Who more than the youth deserve the right to work, learn a trade and live a different life? But because they are born into this antiquated system of capitalism they must suffer for crimes they have not committed. What's their prospects?

The outlook in heavy engineering is anything but bright, with Babcock and Wilcox laying off men and Parkhead Forge having a handful of men left. Light engineering is not much better: Rolls-Royce are on a four-day week and in Remington Rand there is redundancy. Everywhere you go there, it is 'redundancy' or 'no vacancies'.

The Tory plans for the mines and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now for the railway workshops have been announced. In Glasgow alone over a thousand men will lose their jobs on the railways. But nowhere is the Tory policy going to be taken without a fight. In St. Rollox, Cowlairs, Colmadie and other shops, the men are demonstrating against it.

It is said by the best authorities on shipbuilding, that to keep the present world fleets supplied with ships and repairs, would take less than half the world's shipbuilding industry. In Scotland 464,000 tons of new ships were built last year, but only 170,000 tons new orders have been obtained. On the Clyde some yards have been closed; others which employed over a thousand men are now employing less than a hundred. Only one or two can safely say they have enough work to last them through the year.

The shop stewards from the upper reaches of the Clyde got together. These meetings led the Boilermakers' and Blacksmiths' shop stewards to adopt a five-point programme, which was previously endorsed by the Boilermakers' Society. They favour nationalisation of the industry, but in the meantime, that a Minister of Shipping should be set up, to deal with shipping and its servicing industries, shipbuilding and ship repair. At present, control of the industry is in private hands with Mr. Marples, Minister of Transport as the Government Minister dealing with shipping affairs. When you look at the state of the sections of transport he is responsible for you can judge how much he will do for the shipbuilding industry. The shop stewards support a scrap-and-build policy, allowing a ship the life of twenty years; all British ships should be built in British shipyards; and more research and development in the industry. The shop stewards arranged a meeting through the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions with Jean Roberts, Glasgow's Lord Provost. Putting forward their proposals, they made it clear that 1,115,000 tons of new ships every year would be needed for a secure base for the industry, whose total output was 1,169,700 tons in 1962.

The Lord Provost decided to call a meeting of all the local authorities on the Clyde. Up here in Scotland the railwaymen, miners, engineers and shipbuilders are demonstrating against redundancy, and in their demonstrations, have made it clear that they are not prepared to wait until the Tories have their General Election; they are demanding one now. In recent meetings outside the Labour Exchanges, a big percentage of the unemployed has shown their willingness to fight for work or better benefits: the army of unemployed is moving towards being more organised; like they were in the 'thirties. But as well as a proper organised movement of unemployed, we need more trade union special Conferences, not only to lay down a more positive line of action but to knit a closer pattern of unity. Now is the time, too, for every branch of the Communist Party to hold meetings, at the street corners, factory gates and labour exchanges, and to put an end to any undue fear of communists and communism, and rouse the people against this Government.

I read with admiration about the movement in Liverpool, of the Welsh Lobby in February, of how the North East are going to descend on London in March: we shall be there. That only leaves me to say: roll on Socialism.

CHARLES MAXWELL,
Glasgow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the North-East

PROBLEMS of the North-East are essentially common to British capitalist economy as a whole, aggravated as they have been by government policy. Adding 'redundancy' on the railways to pit closures, by policies restricting capital development, the Tories have created a depression in steel, while undermining shipbuilding over the years by putting barriers in the way of orders from Socialist countries.

It is our basic industries which need development: if the sole cure is to be the panacea of 'new industries', it can become a myth and a delusion. For the North-East it would mean a prospect of the women being the mainstay and the men on the dole, with mines, steel works and shipyards closing down. Any new industrial development to be healthy must be dependent on expansion in basic industries. Again, we must challenge any idea that 'war means work'. What spelt trouble was the war work, with tanks at Vickers in Newcastle, and Sea Slug destroyers at Wallsend. For it meant money and resources used up in what proves to be scrap iron which could have been put to building and selling tractors and cargo vessels. This would have opened up further economic expansion and more work ahead, not less. Arms expenditure led only to tax burdens and even further economic difficulties.

Lord Hailsham is not the first Minister in recent years to be sent on a trip to the North-East to 'investigate' unemployement (65,000 here even before the vast increase to 932,939 nationally was admitted in February). When Maudling, as President of the Board of Trade, came to Jarrow two years ago, he was met by a demonstration which told him to 'stop dawdling'. Then Hare came through Darlington and Newcastle with sunshine talk about 'jobs in the pipeline'; that was more a pipe-dream, since with more unemployment the 'jobs in the pipeline' dry up too. And now, the Bell-ringer Hailsham is sent 'to investigate'. What the trade union and labour movement is demanding is a total 'change of Tory Government policy'. And that is in the interests of the British people as a whole; for the problems, aggravated in the North-East, are common to British capitalist economy as a whole. The vast Lobby to Parliament at the end of the month by all the Federations of Trades Councils of the North underline this in striking fashion.

HORACE GREEN,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne

TWO STEPS BACK

The British economy is sounder today than at any time since the first world war. . . . We have now stabilised the cost of living while maintaining full employment.

The Next Five Years (*Conservative Election Manifesto*), 1959.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BLACK AND YELLOW

Wilfred Macartney

QUEUEING for the cashier at a bank in Cairo in September 1917, I glanced at the large sum of money being drawn by a tall cavalry Major before me. I was going to have a day at the races before rejoining my Division, the 52nd Lowland, a month or so before Allenby's Gaza attack. I had been seconded to Greece a year before.

'Good Luck, Your Grace; they say so and so is going to win', and the cashier mentioned a horse's name to the tall Major.

I remarked: 'Are you going to the races, Sir?'

He said: 'Yes'.

'I hope you do not lose all that money', I replied.

He laughed and we fell into conversation and walked towards Groppi's, a famous cafe. As we entered, I made the usual facetious remark of an infantry subaltern about 'Groppi's Lancers, the Westminster Dragoons', a Yeomanry Regiment doing guard duty in Cairo, whose officers frequented Groppi.

'Don't be too hard on them, they are very bored', said the Major. We spent a pleasant day at the races and that was the only time I met the Second Duke of Westminster,* who owned several acres of gold and diamond studded land in Mayfair, where embassies and private palaces vied with each other in opulence and grandeur.

Between the wars, my amiable racing companion became embittered by racial passions and prejudice. Lady Norwich in her *Memoirs* says that 'Bendor' (a chestnut colt of his grandfather's which won the Derby—hence Westminster's nickname) was barmy in his hostility to the Jews and Negroes; and she tells us how on the eve of the declaration of war, at the Savoy Hotel, the Duke was excoriated by Duff Cooper, not a good tempered man at the best of times and unlikely to stand any nonsense at that particular moment about wicked Jews and nice Nazis. The Grosvenor Estate always had many embassies and legations, maybe as many as 80 per cent of the diplomatic missions to the Court of St. James had Grosvenor leaseholds. The problem of colour and race discrimination did not arise till after the World Wars for the simple reason that there were few coloured sovereign states (and, of course, Israel was merely a dream); hence there *were* no coloured ambassadors,

*The late Hugh Richard Arthur Grosvenor, Baronet; Baron Grosvenor; Earl Grosvenor and Viscount Belgrave; Marquess of Westminster; Duke of Westminster. Owned 'about 30,000 acres in Cheshire and Flintshire, besides an estate in Scotland and 600 acres in London'. (*Who's Who.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministers nor high commissioners. Since 1945 with the fragmentation of the Colonial powers, the situation has altered and there are many more diplomatic missions. These have been further increased by the American stars and stripes flying over more Embassy buildings on the Grosvenor Estate than there are states in the Union; including one up-to-date private prison on the top of a modern building.

In 1947 Ceylon became an independent member of the British Commonwealth. The first High Commissioner, Sir Oliver Goonetilleke, K.C.M.G., K.B.E., began looking for a residence and chancellery at a fair price. Lady Baillie, sister of Miss Dorothy Paget, the race-horse owner, held an 87-year lease of 25, Grosvenor Square. Just before the war, Lady Baillie, a woman of great taste, great discrimination and, above all, great wealth, had practically rebuilt 25, Grosvenor Square. As an embassy it was a natural; magnificent Italian marble staircase, great state rooms leading to a flagged garden where the suspension of a marquee gave space for hundreds of guests. The ballroom could dance as many couples as were likely to be found outside a Palais de Dance. There were lifts, bathrooms and sun-traps; and what was more, a bomb had blown away the house next door, so that No. 25, Grosvenor Square became a corner site and likely to remain so for some time. (And indeed it did, till the Americans bought for £2 million all the leases of the west side of Grosvenor Square, pulled down the twenty or so houses and put up what appears to be a box of reinforced glass and metal, looking something like a modern military prison.) As the High Commissioner and Lady Baillie dealt direct without estate agents, the matter went with dispatch and without publicity. The High Commissioner paid £50,000 for an 87-year lease, a bargain if ever there was one.

It was about this time that 'The U.S. Office of Property Operations in Europe' became aware that 25, Grosvenor Square housed a capable and charming but nevertheless coloured High Commissioner and that his pleasant staff were all Asians.

The Americans in Grosvenor Square were horrified, especially when carrying parcels from their PX in North Audley Street, they wandered past No. 25. The White Man's Burden should not be a big parcel of goodies and gum-chum. This dark stain must be erased. The United States Ambassador offered his colleague a profit to get out and transfer the lease to the U.S.A. The immediate reaction of the High Commissioner was a kind of headlong transi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion from thought to action which made one think that we would have a hot war before the cold one had even started. Through the bleak channels of diplomatic indignation, the offer and the profit were refused.

With the imperishable impudence of outsiders and bounders who think all the world is the loot of persistence, the U.S. Government went behind the High Commissioner's back to his Prime Minister, D. S. Senanayake, a subtle and experienced politician, who was somewhat of a rugged character, and was not thinking of letting down his loyal High Commissioner; so he brusquely refused to quit this most sacred of squares.

About this time Cripps was entering his dollar obsessional phase and the Americans aware of this began to pressure Cripps to persuade the Ceylon Government to take the profit and, what is more, promised to pay in New Dollars. Up to this time people thought that the almighty dollar was the same all the world over, but now they learnt that there was a division in the God-head. A New Dollar was one that was actually sent directly to London from the U.S.A. and not one that had been lying about the place for some time. The witch-doctors at the Treasury and their acolytes in the City had smelt out all the old dollars and knew exactly how many there were in the country and when the opportunity arose of squeezing some New Ones out of the Federal Reserve Deity, they welcomed it; in short, dollars held on account in England were augmented. Cripps imagined that it would be good business for the new dominions, apparently being ignorant that Ceylon, with its rubber, tea and graphite, were not in need of dollars; so the matter rested.

King George VI and Queen Elizabeth with much ceremony inaugurated the new Embassy, and although the American Ambassador gamely walked across the square to the grand reception, his visage was solemn. While this was going on, the Indonesian Ambassador, again acting without an agent, or publicity, took a lease and moved into the other side of the square. This was too much for the Americans, who started all over again the same tactic, with even less success. Now, the Coat of Arms of the U.S.A. and the Indonesian Republic are similar and, when the shield is set up high over the portico, almost indistinguishable from the Bald-Headed Eagle; this led to a number of long Yankee cars obstructing the entrance and visitors cluttering up the Indonesian waiting-rooms; the visitors were puzzled and the American drivers became rude

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and insolent. However, the Indonesians had engaged through the usual channels (the Foreign Office), a number of cockney chauffeurs; these stood no nonsense and a *modus vivendi* was only reached after the tyres of all the American cars in Grosvenor Square were repeatedly deflated, along with their racial ego.

In 1950 the work of the Ceylon High Commissioner had grown and the Mission was considering extending its premises, so it became a practical proposition to sell to the Americans. Office space was becoming rare. This time negotiations were opened by an estate agent, who, after much coming and going, justified his occupation by selling No. 25, Grosvenor Square for about £100,000, just double what Lady Baillie had received and Ceylon had paid.

To digress, the estate agent was Howard Samuel, who in the years to come became, through inflation in land and property, a multi-millionaire, and through this and the Titmus dispensation, turned into a kind of patron of some sections of the Left. This tycoon subsidised *The Tribune* to the extent of £30,000 a year. He bought McGibbon & Kee, the publishers, and had a one-third holding in the *New Statesman*. He perished tragically engulfed in the Aegean outside Athens, when he had nearly completed the purchase of the controlling interest in Associated Book Publishers, who own Methuen, Chapman & Hall, Eyre and Spottiswoode and E. & F. N. Spon. But for his early death, he might have become the biggest publisher in the country, rivalling Hutchinson, for he left nearly £5 million and up to now there seems to be no deflation of property values; this loathsome frog which swells over the green countryside refuses to blow itself up.

After the exchange of contracts, the Americans began to smart and sought to balm their wounds by redressing the balance in favour of the new world by delaying completion, a thing unknown of in diplomatic property transactions. In fact, they practically refused to complete. The Ceylon Government was furious at the inconvenience and amazed at their behaviour.

Round about this time there was a great hoo-hah in the United Nations about voting strength: for example, the British Commonwealth had New Zealand, Canada, Australia, South Africa and some others voting pro-American, while the Soviet Union had one vote; so that reasonable people suggested that some of the great states of the Union such as the Ukraine, with a population of 40 million, should equate New Zealand with 1½ millions. The Americans opposed, saying that as these states did not have separate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diplomatic representation, they were not justified in voting; and so the wrangle continued. At this moment a press lord, and what was more helpful, his editor-in-chief, were enjoying an embittered squabble with the American State Department (or more accurately the Federal Reserve Bank) about money, something to do with cable rates, a very expensive item in a daily newspaper. Someone told the editor the story of the delay in Grosvenor Square. The editor flew a *canard* and printed in his great national daily that the Ukranian Government were negotiating to purchase 25, Grosvenor Square from the Ceylon Government. A couple of hours after this item was printed in the first edition, the estate agent rushed the cutting to the Yankees who, although they had felt uncomfortable with coloured neighbours, were so frightened at the idea of having Communists in their darling square, that they completed within two hours; and, what was more, promptly bought the twenty neighbouring houses aforementioned.

Of course, there were a few Asian Legations and Embassies who were established on some freehold *enclave* within the Grosvenor Empire's borders; others already had leases on the Grosvenor Estate: these could not be disturbed. (Incidentally, the Israeli Government do not have their Embassy on the Grosvenor Estate.)

A few years ago, there was in South Audley Street a most magnificently appointed mansion housing the International Music Club, sponsored by a rich American lady interested in music far beyond the call of duty. After some years her indulgence of musical temperament, and perhaps the expense, became too heavy and the property and its contents were put on the market. Not since the war, or indeed before, had there been so lavishly equipped a club in London, so that a buyer was soon found and a deposit of nearly £10,000 paid to an estate agent. Negotiations went swimmingly, till the Superior Landlords were asked for the usual permission to assign. It was then discovered that the new tenants would be the Japanese Mission.

Now, at that time, no matter how close was MacArthur's friendship for the sons of Nippon, the U.S.A. certainly were not going to have them thronging Grosvenor Square; so the poor agent had to return the deposit and wait several months and then, with envy and exasperation, watch another agent sell the property to an Anglo-American store, Selfridges, for its staff.

Then there was Forbes House, behind St. George's Hospital, which came on the market seven years ago. It had been the resi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dence of Lord Granard. Before the war some forty servants maintained the marble halls and great staircases in order and decency. During the war the building was used by the Army and bombed about a bit. The place was most suitable for an embassy. A double-carriage drive and nearly three-quarters of an acre of grounds were just the thing for diplomatic receptions, where parking is so restricted in London's traffic. The People's Republic of China considered leasing the property and negotiations were begun. They lasted a long time. The property had been vacant for nearly ten years; but nevertheless obstacles were not overcome and the property is still empty to this day.

The late Duke of Westminster's racing colours were Black and Yellow; but they are no longer carried on race-horses and his Executors are bleating about death duties. What with the ghost of 'Bendor' and the prejudice of the United States and others, we find that more than half-way through the twentieth century, when man has reached out and grasped the stars, the golden square mile of Mayfair has anachronisms and prejudices hard to believe.

VOTING IN UNITED NATIONS

[*In December, 1960, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted without a dissenting vote a 'Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples', in which it proclaimed the necessity to bring colonialism—in all its forms and manifestations—to a speedy and unconditional end. By December, 1962, the Assembly was deploring the refusal of certain administering powers to co-operate in its implementation. In this context too, resolutions were passed bearing on Central, South-West and South Africa, and all these have been given only limited attention in our national press. It was felt that our readers might like to have available for reference, the texts of some of the key resolutions. We are therefore pleased to print them, together with the voting figures, and as a further guide, we show in each case what countries the United Kingdom voted with and how their vote was cast.*—*Ed.*, L.M.]

December 14, 1960

THE SUBJECTION OF PEOPLES to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

All peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their econo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mic, social and cultural development.

Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.

All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.

Immediate steps shall be taken in trust and non-self-governing territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.

Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

All states should observe faithfully and strictly the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all states and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity.

(*Voting:* Adopted unanimously.)

December 17, 1962

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY recalling its resolution of December 14, 1960 and resolution of November 27, 1961, by which it established the Special Committee of seventeen for the implementation of this Declaration . . . *notes* with profound regret that, in spite of the efforts of the United Nations the provisions of the Declaration have not been fully implemented in a large number of territories, and that in certain cases even preliminary measures have not yet been taken to realise its objectives . . .

The Assembly *declares* that it solemnly reiterates and reaffirms the objective and principles enshrined in the Declaration; *deplores* the refusal of certain administering powers to co-operate in the implementation of the Declaration in territories under their administration; *calls upon* the administering powers concerned to cease forthwith all armed action and repressive measures directed against peoples who have not yet attained their independence, and particularly against the political activities of their rightful leaders; and *urges* all administering powers to take immediate steps in order that all colonial territories and peoples may accede to independence without delay.

(*Voting:* 101 in favour; none against; 4 abstentions. UNITED KINGDOM abstained together with FRANCE, SOUTH AFRICA, and SPAIN. Portugal did not attend.)

November 6, 1962

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, recalling its previous resolutions on the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the government of the Republic of South Africa, *deplores* the failure of that government to comply with the repeated requests and demands of the General Assembly and of the Security Council and its flouting of world public opinion by refusing to abandon its racial policies; *strongly deprecates* the con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinued and total disregard by the government of South Africa of its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and furthermore, its determined aggravation of racial issues by enforcing measures of increasing ruthlessness involving violence and bloodshed; *requests* Member States to take the following measures, separately or collectively, in conformity with the Charter, to bring about the abandonment of those policies:—

Breaking off diplomatic relations with the government of the Republic of South Africa or refraining from establishing such relations;

Closing their ports to all vessels flying the South African Flag;

Enacting legislation prohibiting their ships from entering South African ports;

Boycotting all South African goods and refraining from exporting goods, including all arms and ammunition to South Africa; and

Refusing landing and passage facilities to all aircraft belonging to the government and companies registered under the laws of South Africa.

(*Voting:* 67 in favour; 16 against; 23 abstentions. UNITED KINGDOM voted against together with: CANADA, FRANCE, GREECE, IRELAND, JAPAN, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, PORTUGAL, SOUTH AFRICA, SPAIN, TURKEY, UNITED STATES.)

TRADE UNION GROWTH

Jim Gardner

AT the present time a wide discussion is developing on the future of trade union organisation. The last Trades Union Congress instructed the General Council to prepare a full report. The Communist Party has published for its coming Easter Congress a draft resolution on 'The Future of Trade Unionism', which represents the first attempt to make a comprehensive examination of the problems and present concrete proposals.

In the light of current discussion on trade union organisation, it is interesting to read Professor Turner's book *Trade Union Growth, Structure and Policy** which although primarily a study of cotton trade unionism, has a much wider interest in that it embraces comparisons with trade union developments in other occupations and industries from the early stages of the industrial revolution until modern times. It traces the continuing (ephemeral in early stages) development of cotton trade unionism from the mid-eighteenth century and its functions and ability to protect and improve living standards. The author disclaims it as an 'historian's study' although 'favouring history', but it does bring out the 'militancy of the cotton workers in action' before and after the mid-nineteenth century when

**Trade Union Growth, Structure and Policy*, H. A. Turner. Allen & Unwin, 414 pp. 45s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the existing Cotton Unions were firmly established. In their earliest formations the combinations of cotton workers had an occupational basis (spinners, weavers and the various ancillary trades in separate unions) and were local in character, features retained in the cotton union amalgamations of today and which corresponded with the early trade union formations in other industries.

The early stages of the cotton unions are associated with the break-through of science in providing new technologies and new sources of motive power which spelt the ultimate demise of cottage manufacture and the development of factory production. He compares the Spinners Union, a closed union with a controlled intake of membership although not with an apprenticeship qualification, with the new model Craft Unions of the 1850s. The Weavers Union, an open union to all textile workers, is assessed as the forerunner of the non-craft general unions of the 1890s. The Spinners' exclusiveness is estimated as having a stifling effect on collective organisation, an assessment that has application to craft unions in other industries. On the other hand the open Union of Weavers is credited as actively encouraging the development of the broader labour organisation a half century before their reappearance in the 1890s.

The evolution of trade unionism is traced against the background of a changing and expanding economy with its cycles of boom and slump; the development of new industries and new motive power resources; an increasingly rapid change in technology; the growing concentration of capital and centralisation of production. Through different stages the trade unions have developed from local occupational combinations to the Consolidated National Craft Union of the 1850s. Their exclusiveness paved the way to the rise of the non-craft General Labour Unions. Both have had their impact on each other and on the general structure of trade unionism as we know it today.

In the thirty years 1890/1920 the mass labour unions developed alongside the craft unions and by various amalgamations and takeovers changed the character of both. The craft unions became less exclusive, accepting into membership the lesser skilled and unskilled workers working alongside or servicing the main occupational group, but still closed unions within these wider limits. On the other hand, the general labour unions absorbed the new semi-skilled workers and even skilled workers, some by amalgamation but mainly by greater organising resources, which enabled them to recruit more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effectively in the newer expanding industries and in the factories based on new advanced production techniques in which craft skills are minimal.

The degree to which trade union democracy in the mill, shop or other place of work has a direct influence on union policy is examined as is the extent to which a union's internal character is reflected in its constitutional development. There are relatively few unions in which the branch is situated at, or directly related to the place of work. A fair proportion make provision in their constitution for shop stewards but union administration is in most cases without direct influence from organised shop activity. Union elections or other voting, does not involve the shop steward in most unions and is done in the branch where attendance is meagre and results in poor returns.

A differentiation is made between the modern descendants of the new unions and of the craft unions, the former clearly adapted to a popular bossdom and the latter having an exclusive democracy by opening its ranks to a sort of second class citizen. There is an element of truth in this assessment although some of the descendants of the craft unions come very near to the bossdom status. A more direct link with the grass roots at place of work in trade union administration would repair some of the deficiencies in trade union democracy.

Of particular interest are the chapters on trade union 'democracy' and 'organisation and leadership'. These subjects form part of the draft resolution of the Communist Party of Great Britain on 'The Future of Trade Unionism' which has created so much interest in the national press. Structure of individual unions is conditioned by occupational coverage and scope of recruitment, varying from the craft unions to the mass multi-industrial unions and subject to internal and external pressures.

New sectionalisms (occupational groups) form and crystallise and existing sectionalisms yield to technical, economic and institutional change. This leads in the natural course of structural evolution to the splitting off of new occupational identities from membership of the mass unions and also through regrouping, by way of merger and federation, of the new occupational groups into alliances for bargaining and other purposes.

This is a continuing process and substantially corresponds to the reforms envisaged in the T.U.C. 1924 report on structure which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recommended that sectional associations be permitted within existing unions and be allowed to federate with other similar interests. Such a development is, however, inhibited since it is in conflict with the views of the leaders of the mass unions on the need of their own union stability. The 1924 recommendations were not repeated in the T.U.C. 1946 report on structure. New occupational groups are unable to form a new union within the organisational sphere of a major union, however ineffectively it has organised the section concerned, without committing the major sin (and a breach of the Bridlington Congress decisions) of a breakaway.

It is clear from the Communist Party's draft resolution that Communists are concerned with trade union unity. They will examine every development by that standard, opposing splits, however well intentioned, if they weaken unity in the struggle for decent living standards. Communists oppose bureaucracy and the class collaborationist leadership of the trade union movement.

With regard to the foregoing it is interesting that it is in the mass unions that the lay member is considered to be more detached from the leadership and more prone to bureaucracy. Significant also—attention is given to the fact that it was the two large labour unions, or their powerful leaders, that were the most solid supporters of the 1945/57 Labour Government's attempt to impose wage restraint.

In his conclusion, Professor Turner brings out the weakness of multi-unionism at the industrial and workplace levels in the formulation of national economic and industrial policies through the T.U.C. he sees the concentration of union power in the great and relatively centralised organisations, as inhibiting agreement on effective programmes to deal with contemporary labour issues at the level of individual industries. This he considers paradoxical, since the many amalgamations that produced these concentrations were often advocated on the ground that they would promote concerted action at industrial level. This is all too true.

There is much more in this book than can possibly be dealt with in a short article. It should be read as a background to the current discussions on trade union organisation, purpose and policy initiated at the Blackpool T.U.C. 1962 and carried forward in the Communist Party's draft resolution. Their purpose is clear and needs no redefining. In defending and advancing the living and working standards of their members, the trade unions exist as a challenge to established 'profit' motives of production. This challenge can only be finally implemented when ownership of industry is brought

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into harmony with the social forces of production. Inadequate as Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution and Rule 4 of the T.U.C. may be, they show the socialist way forward and express the basic traditional aims of the trade union movement. That there is need to define trade union policy and strengthen trade union organisation for the realisation of these aims is only common sense at this time, when ownership of industry is so firmly entrenched within the framework of monopoly state capitalism. Professor Turner does not say this but the logic of his study of trade union structure and policy is inescapable. He has made a useful contribution to this discussion.

BOOKS

Income Distribution and Social Change
Prof. R. M. Titmuss
George Allen & Unwin. 1962. 25s. 240 pp.

Takeover
William Mennell
Lawrence & Wishart. 1962. 25s. 212 pp.

IT IS now some seventy years since the Trades Union Congress came out in favour of public ownership of the means of production, and over forty years since socialism in this sense became the official policy of the Labour Party. However, throughout these years the Labour movement has witnessed an unceasing struggle about the 'meaning of socialism', in which the reformist right-wing has been trying to steer the movement away from the aim of taking ownership and control of the means of production out of the hands of the capitalist class. Recently —since Keynes—the line of the attack has been: 'The slogan of public ownership is now old-fashioned and out of date. Ownership—whether public or private—is a matter of convenience and should not be made a matter of principle. We have now learned—thanks largely to Keynes—how to manage capitalism. So let us be "modern", drop Clause Four and cease worrying about private ownership.'

These right-wing attacks have made some headway but thanks largely to the sound instincts of the working-class rank and file, so far the right-wing onslaught on public ownership has failed in its objective. Socialism (in the Dictionary sense of the word 'ownership and control of the means of production . . . by the community as a whole' O.E.D.) still is the policy of the Labour Party. But I think it must be admitted that the arguments on which socialists have relied have too often been 'good old truths' and not often enough 'good new truths'. One never can take the present for granted; it is essential to study its particularities. The enemies of socialism have used superficialities derived from contemporary experience for attacking socialism; and socialists to rebut these attacks need constantly to arm themselves with fresh understanding of the contemporary reality. That is why these are two invaluable books. They delve deeply and truthfully into British monopoly capitalism as it is today. They should be widely read

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and constantly consulted by socialists and active trade unionists. They should be readily available in all the libraries that workers use.

A review such as this cannot be a substitute for reading the books themselves and the best it can do is to give some idea of their contents. *Takeover* deals with the growth of monopoly in Britain in a well informed, thorough and factual way. As its title suggests its central theme is the scramble by millionaire interests, during the last decade particularly, to buy themselves controlling interests in new spheres. An excellent chapter ('The Bargain Basement') explains the specific historical setting in which particular contradictions within capitalist society fanned the flames of stock and property speculation. High taxation encouraged 'the frantic search for capital gains in the Stock Exchange and elsewhere in recent years, which has made its own special contribution to the inflationary process, which taxation has been increased to combat—and so *ad infinitum*'. All sorts of devices were used for raising capital and countless anomalies showed themselves; these in turn opened new possibilities for sharp manipulators, and this in turn encouraged the biggest established monopolies to tighten their ranks, to effect mergers and become still bigger. The excellent introductory chapters are followed by careful surveys of particular fields (backed by comprehensive detail in the appendices). These include food, drink and tobacco; monopolies in trade; chemicals and man-made fibres; the press; insurance and investment trusts. Concluding chapters deal with anti-monopoly legislation and the facts about share ownership.

Professor Titmuss is already well-known for his recent booklet *The Irresponsible Society* and also as an expert over many years on social conditions in Britain. He is an academic with two rare qualities—a penetrating instinct in his choice of subjects to investigate and courage in following the evidence of truth wherever it leads. His latest book *Income Distribution and Social Change* is sub-titled 'A Study in Criticism'—criticism that probes the complacent myths of a 'reformed capitalism' down to their deepest foundations. He does a real Perry Mason on the star witnesses against socialism, the learned authorities who have been so repeatedly testifying in recent years that this 'reformed capitalism' has been progressively eliminating the inequalities between the classes. He probes by asking accurate, pertinent, well-informed questions and thereby revealing that the authorities, that is, both the public authorities who provide the statistical raw material and the academic authorities who use it, do not know—very literally—what they are talking, or writing, about. For example, when they make statements about the distribution of income they do not show, or know, what income covers and does not cover, nor what the income receiving units are. Basic ideas such as these are pursued down to the last detail; and in the course of pursuit Professor Titmuss unearths innumerable devices by which the rich avoid tax or find means of living as they choose within the structure of existing legislation—legislation by which it is generally supposed that wealth is distributed away from them to the workers and poorer sections of the population.

It is because this book is so rich in its detail and so realistic in its understanding of the actual goings on in modern capitalist society, that every Labour organisation should be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sure that they have it and use it as a constant source of reference. By way of illustration I will refer to just one section of the professor's argumentation. He takes Mr. Lydall's hitherto widely accepted statement based on Inland Revenue statistics, that the top 1% of incomes accounted in 1938 for 16·2% of all allocated income before tax as against 8·0% in 1957—apparently a catastrophic turn for the worse in the fortunes of the very rich. (The British monopoly capitalist class is virtually comprised within this one per cent). He then proceeds to list eleven factors which have been neglected in the interpretation of these figures. These include (p. 51): 'More units reduced in value as a result of the operation of irrevocable settlements, discretionary trusts, family and educational trusts and gifts *inter vivos* in favour of children, grandchildren or other kin and "life tenants" by parents, grandparents and other relatives by blood and marriage; . . . More units reduced in value as a result of deliberate reductions of high salaries to spread income into retirement and pay less tax over the life span as a whole; More units reduced in value so as to acquire the right to tax-free lump sums of up to £40,000 or more on actual or nominal retirement; and more incomes reduced in value as a result of higher expense accounts'.

No review can do justice to these and the many similar points with which Professor Titmuss deals with searching precision but if socialists use this book and William Mennell's *Takeover* as a quarry for information and ideas, the conviction will soon spread to more and more people that our short-term policies for improving social services, assuaging the effects of poverty, stimulating production and so forth, will lead nowhere unless they bring us at the same time closer to the day when the hands of private wealth and class interest can be removed altogether from the thousand or so multi-millionaire firms that dominate our econmic life. About three-quarters of our national wealth flows through the private precincts of these concerns before reaching the people it should be sustaining and too many private hands dip into the passing stream. Only when these establishments can carry the notice 'Public Property—no pilfering', will social authority be able surely to control the flow and direction of social income and expenditure.

JOHN EATON.

To Katanga and Back

Conor Cruise O'Brien

Hutchinson. 372 pp. 35s.

EVERY ACUTE CRISIS point today becomes a kind of microcosm of world politics. Nowhere was this more so than in the Congo during the period from the murder of Lumumba to the death of Hammerskjold. Hence this is a fascinating book. A civil servant representing the exactest norm of Ireland's radical bourgeoisie was seconded to the United Nations service, sent to the crucial hot-spot to do a job, did it, and was promptly and unceremoniously sacked amid obloquy and objurgations. In the process he uncovered a seething cauldron of violence and intrigue. His narrative *To Katanga and Back* should be read by everybody anxious to know how imperialism really works. Written with a dry wit which revels in understatement, it has been described as a 'cynical book'. It is about as cynical as Swift's *Modest Proposal* for mitigating the poverty of the Irish peasants by fattening

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their children for the tables of the landlords. O'Brien's anti-imperialism also (like Swift's anti-landlordism but with less excuse), though thoroughly committed, does not push through to the point where its social alternative is fully grasped.

O'Brien was Hammerskjold's personal choice for the difficult task of securing the application of the Security Council resolution of February 21, 1961. Passed just after the 'killing' of Lumumba, it urged the U.N. to 'take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for cease-fires, the halting of military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary, in the last resource'. Mr. Zorin, who abstained, warned that the resolution could mean all things to all men. British delegate Sir Patrick Dean confirmed this view by stating an interesting reservation that force should only be used to prevent clashes 'between hostile Congolese forces'. O'Brien held the view that Hammerskjold had selected him as the best representative of an alternative 'Americo-Afro-Asian' interpretation, which he at once set about putting into effect. Although he notes and criticises the deliberate withholding of information from the Soviet staff at the U.N., and recognises that Soviet strictures were 'not unreasonable', he does not seem to have suspected that American imperialism, robbed by events of its automatic majority in the Assembly, might think of enlisting Afro-Asian sentiment in a crusade, the object of which was not the freedom of the Congo, but a financially satisfactory adjustment with other imperialisms.

His first task in Katanga was to ensure the withdrawal of the Belgian and other mercenaries. His experiences convinced him that the true rulers of Katanga were the businessmen of the Union Minière, who for their own purposes required the 'black façade'. Tshombe, the successful grocer, is not unsympathetically drawn as a kind of cork surviving thanks to a capacity to bob up after every immersion. It was typical of him that moments of crisis took him either to the British consulate or to Rhodesia. Munongo he sees as a political heavyweight in his own right, allied to imperialism for the sake of the auld lang syne of tribalism and the slave trade. The politics of Katanga, he clearly demonstrates, are copper, copper and copper—with a few pounds of cobalt and uranium thrown in. The complex intertwining of economic and political interests is well shown. Particularly valuable is O'Brien's scathing, factual exposure of imperialist humbug, the 'spontaneous native demonstrations' which 'indicated a surprisingly accurate appreciation of the alignment of the Powers', the 'beautiful friendship between black and white' (that is, Tshombe doing the Union Minière's work for it), and the campaign of slander against the Baluba whose 'backwardness', imposed by the colonial régime, became a justification for slaughtering them as soon as they showed signs of wishing to end it. Incidentally, O'Brien shows clearly enough that if 'top people' read what they are supposed to read, quite important items of Congo news must have failed to reach them.

O'Brien came to grief through his part in operation 'Morthor', aimed, as he says, at ending the secession of Katanga. He had been told that Hammerskjold was aware of it and had given consent. Though reflection has modified his early admiration of that enigmatic gentleman, O'Brien

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not suggest that his subsequent disowning of 'Morthor' arose merely from its military failure. He believes Hammerskjold retreated under British pressure. This is, however, to let the American administration off scot free. What seems to show through is that O'Brien, the Irishman who saw the resemblance of Katanga to Northern Ireland, was drawn into applying a purely 'Afro-Asian' interpretation of the February resolution, but it was the British who forced the re-incorporation of the 'American' element. The conclusion? Afro-Asian alone will not suffice, much less Americo-Afro-Asian. The world contains socialist states also. To attempt to solve the international aspects of the Congo question without them is the parallel to tackling the internal aspects without Lumumba, that is, without the Congolese people.

Many people believe Irish neutrality died in the Congo. When O'Brien went there British papers were declaring that Irish neutrality could be a useful façade for rallying the Afro-Asians behind imperialist policies. Whether it is yet dead is a matter of opinion. Mercifully it refuses to lie down. Mr. O'Brien's courageous stand won universal support among the Irish people and his frank 'case history' perhaps also serves to warn that no matter how assiduously the rulers of small countries curry favour with imperialism, the facts of life, through the agency of ordinary people, will inevitably force them back into conflict with it—or send them away down the river of history.

C. DESMOND GREAVES.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books-pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

Goering

Roger Manvell & Heinrich Fraenkel

Heinemann. 430 pp. 35s.

THIS BIOGRAPHY is somewhat uneven. A minor fault is that it falls a little between two stools over the difficulty of writing a life of a man, who was as actively and prominently involved as Goering was in the running of Nazism throughout its existence, without at the same time writing the history of Nazism itself; and a more serious defect is that it gives an almost favourable and friendly picture of the truly abominable blackguard of whom the Nuremberg tribunal so rightly wrote: 'His guilt is unique in its enormity . . . . The record discloses no excuse for this man'. It is not easy to understand how the writers, who carried out very full research, can have found it possible to say so much in the man's favour; they may have been caught by his superficial charm, or they have been 'leaning over backwards' in an effort to be objective. Whatever their reasons, the fault—as I see it—is there; it can be said in mitigation that they record faithfully and fully the innumerable matters and events which go to establish how vile Goering really was.

The book has two clear merits; firstly, it gives one more correct overall picture of Nazi rottenness and of the practice and technique of its leading figures in stabbing each other in the back for their own advantage; and secondly, it quotes some

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examples of the apparent gullibility of Chamberlain and his ministers, particularly Halifax, in swallowing any story the Nazis told them. (I say 'apparent' gullibility, for they were only too willing to swallow anything that would enable them to avoid action and favour the Nazis).

The book is curiously defective in dealing with the responsibility for the burning of the Reichstag. The writers deal with this at some length, but ignore a substantial part of the cogent evidence now available, to an extent which tends to shake faith in the thoroughness of the rest of their research. One particular failure is in respect of the Reichstag Fire Enquiry Commission, consisting of seven lawyers from seven different countries, which sat in London in September, 1933, heard a large body of evidence, and arrived at important conclusions which were well received by the Press and the public. The writers totally ignore these conclusions, and one might suspect that they had never even heard of the Commission, if they had not mentioned that one of them attended its sittings. The degree of attention he paid to it may be judged by his statement that Sir Stafford Cripps 'played a prominent part' in it; the truth is that Cripps took no part whatever in its work, but merely attended on the opening day and made a five-minute speech of introduction and welcome. The statement in the book that the Enquiry *was taking place* when Goering was giving evidence at Leipzig is also curiously inaccurate; the Commission finished its work and published its conclusions before the Leipzig trial began.

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

[Mr. Pritt was, of course, the President of the famous Reichstag Fire Enquiry Commission. —Ed., *L.M.*]

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Congo My Country. Patrice Lumumba. Pall Mall Press with Barrie and Rockliff. 196 pp. 22s. 6d.
Collected Works. Vol. 5. V. I. Lenin. Lawrence and Wishart. 568 pp. 7s. 6d.
Destination: Amaltheia. Edited by Richard Dixon. Central Books and F.L.P.H. 420 pp. 5s.
A Key to Soviet Politics. Roger Pethybridge. Allen and Unwin. 208 pp. 21s.
The Road to Sharpeville. Bernard Sachs. Dennis Dobson. 190 pp. 25s.
Boys Will be Boys. E. S. Turner. Background Books, Daimon Press. 210 pp. 10s. 6d.
Genghis Khan. Ralph Fox. Background Books, Daimon Press. 178 pp. 10s. 6d.
The God of the Witches. Margaret A. Murray. Background Books, Daimon Press. 168 pp. 9s. 6s.
The Conservative Enemy. C. A. R. Crosland. Jonathan Cape. 252 pp. 30s.
My Old Man. Max Cohen. Hargreaves. 182 pp. 16s.
The Land of Foam. Ivan Yefremov. Central Books. 340 pp. 6s.
Let the Blood of Man Not Flow. M. Stelmalch. Central Books. 326 pp. 6s.
The Shop Stewards. G. W. Target. Gerald Duckworth. 304 pp. 18s.
John Brown. W. E. B. Du Bois. International Publishers (N.Y.). 414 pp. $2.25.
Militarism and Industry. Victor Perlo. International Publishers (N.Y.). 208 pp. $1.65.
Outside the Right. Fenner Brockway. Allen & Unwin. 232 pp. 25s.

BOOKLETS

Towns for Our Times. Labour Party. 40 pp. 2s.
Congo—Prelude to Independence. African Research & Publications. 120 pp. 2s. 6d.
General Strike in the North-East. History Group of the Communist Party. 20 pp. 1s. 6d.
Eight Steps to Peace in Kamerun. One Kamerun Party. 24 pp. 2s.
Science and The Future of Britain. Labour Party. 46 pp. 2s.
Report at Coimbatore. S. A. Dange. All India Trades Union Congress. 71 pp. Rs. 1.25.
Strategy of Revenge. Ernst Henri. Communist Party. 36 pp. 1s.
The Case of the Tearful Tycoon. Emil Bjarnason. T.U. Research Bureau, Vancouver. 16 pp. 25 cents.
Dr. Verwoerd of South Africa. Martin Burger. Christian Action. 30 pp. 1s.
Liberty in Chains. D. N. Pritt. Committee for Democratic Rights in U.S.A. 28 pp. 6d.
Music and Life. Music Group of Communist Party. 16 pp. 1s.
Diary of Ernest Jones, 1839-47. History Group of Communist Party. 22 pp. 1s. 6d.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

SPECIAL CONCESSION.....

AND DELIVERED TO YOUR DOOR!

(All Post Free)

Second Class Mail (Unsealed Envelope)

Great Britain .....One year 21s., six months 10s. 6d.

Overseas .....One year 24s., six months 12s.

Canada.....One year $3.50

U.S.A. .....One year $3.50

First Class Mail (Sealed Envelope)

Great Britain .....One year 23s., six months 11s. 6d.

Commonwealth Countries .....One year 27s. (Canada $4.50)

Outside Commonwealth.....One year 35s. (U.S.A. $5.50)

Airmail

(To those many readers throughout the world, who may wish to have their copy by the speediest mail possible, we quote below some examples of airmail rates for both First Class (sealed envelope) and Second Class (unsealed envelope) airmail. We name but a few countries here, and we shall be pleased to quote rates, on enquiry, for any other country.)

Iraq, Israel .....One year 49s.	(2nd Class)	69s.	(1st Class)
India, Hong Kong .....One year 54s.	,,	99s.	,,
Australia, China .....One year 59s.	,,	114s.	,,
Canada.....One year $8.50	,,	$15	,,
U.S.A. .....One year $7.50	,,	$14	,,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fabian Socialism and English Politics, 1884-1918

A. M. McBRIAR

A critical exposition of the doctrines of Fabian Socialism and their influence in different civic and political organisations, such as the L.C.C., the I.L.P., and the Liberal and Labour Parties. 'The most important analysis of Fabianism before 1914 that has yet been published'. *Times Literary Supplement*. 'The great merit of this work is that it enables us to see the historical edifice of Fabianism as it was'. *Economist*. *50s. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume, 1962

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents, price £1.5.0d., or send 10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d. postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

THE MANAGER, 134, Ballards Lane. LONDON. N.3

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

NEW L.R.D. PAMPHLET

That Was The Promise That Was
Tory Words and Tory Deeds

6d. (8½d. post free)

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED